REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed August 24, 2006. Claims 1-23 are pending in the case. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PerfectXML (http://www.perfectxml.com/nr/aspnetdebug.pdf) in view of East Tennessee State University (http://csciwww.etsu.edu/blair/Using_Debugger.htm, "ETSU"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Office Action asserts that Microsoft Corporation's Visual Studio .NET debugging environment, as described in PerfectXML and ETSU, has all the features and limitations of claim 1.

Claim 1 recites

1.   A memory medium which stores program instructions implementing a graphical user interface (GUI) for debugging a program, wherein, during execution of the program, the program instructions are executable by a processor to perform:

displaying source code for the program in a first GUI element;

receiving first user input to the first GUI element indicating an expression in the source code;

displaying a value of the expression in a tooltip in response to said first user input;

receiving second user input to the tooltip modifying the displayed value, thereby specifying a new value for the expression; and

setting the expression in the program to the new value, wherein the program continues execution in accordance with the new value of the expression.

2

Nowhere do the cited references teach or suggest **receiving second user input to the tooltip modifying the displayed value, thereby specifying a new value for the expression**, as recited in claim 1.

While the cited art (specifically, ETSU) does disclose displaying a variable value (in a tooltip) in response to holding the mouse cursor over the variable name (referred to as "Mouse Over"), nowhere does the cited art disclose receiving user input to the tooltip modifying the displayed value, thereby specifying a new value. In fact, nowhere do PerfectXML or ETSU disclose receiving user input to a tooltip at all.

Similarly, nowhere does the cited art teach or suggest **setting the expression in the program to the new value, wherein the program continues execution in accordance with the new value of the expression**, as further recited in claim 1, where, as claimed, the new value was specified by user input to the tooltip.

In asserting that the cited art discloses these claimed features, the Office Action cites page 108 of PerfectXML. Applicant has reviewed the reference closely, and respectfully submits that the Examiner has mischaracterized the art. For example, Applicant notes that the citation is directed to displaying and changing values in a watch window, clearly described on page 108, here quoted in pertinent part:

> The watch window enables you to type in a specific variable name, control name, or other object and then see what value it contains and what type it is. For now, type in txtEmail.You will see that you can expand this entry into all the control's properties to see what they each contain.
> …
> The other thing that you can do with the watch window is change the value of a variable. **If you click the property value in the Value column in the watch window, you can enter a new value as you see fit**.

Clearly, this watch window functionality has no relationship to tooltips and "mouse over" functions in the described debugging environment. Applicant respectfully submits that those of skill in the art of debugging readily understand that such watch window functionality, well known in the art, is not at all the same as displaying and changing a value of an expression via a tooltip. Nowhere does the cited art describe or even hint at such tooltip functionality as claimed. Thus, the cited art fails to teach or suggest these features of claim 1.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, PerfectXML and ETSU, taken singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the features and limitations of claim 1, and so claim 1 and those claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cite art, and are thus allowable.

Independent claims 18, 19, 20, and 21 include similar limitations as claim 1, and so the above arguments apply with equal force to these claims. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18, 19, 20, and 21, those claims respectively dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cite art, and are thus allowable.

Removal of the 103 rejection of claims 1-23 is respectfully requested.

Applicant also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-82801/JCH.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/
Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: November 16, 2006 JCH/MSW